

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 6 have been amended and new claim 25 has been added. Antecedent support for the claim changes can be found in the drawing and throughout the application. Claims 1-6 and 8-25 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-6 and 8-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (e) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,921 to Ofek in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,962 to Touboul. Claims 23 and 24 are separately rejected as being obvious over Ofek and Touboul in view of an additional reference.

The Examiner equates Ofek's first data storage facility with the first computer in claims 1 and 6 and Ofek's second data storage facility with the second computer. According to claim 1, the first computer and the second computer constitute a computer system, which is connected to a data communication network.

Both claims 1 and 6 refer to at least one computer-to-network connection to connect the first and second computers to the data communication network. With the computer-to-network connection, receipt of data from data communications network is limited to the first computer and transmission of data to the data communications network is limited to the second computer. As argued previously, this is completely different from Ofek's isolating the second data storage facility from the first data storage facility. Isolation in Ofek is between a first computer and a second computer. Independent claim 1 recites that the computer-to-network connection is independent from a computer-to-computer connection between the first computer and the second computer. Independent claim 6 contains similar, but somewhat different language.

With regard to new independent claim 25, this claim recites that data received from the data communications network and data transmitted to the data communications network are limited without otherwise limiting forwarding of verified data in processable form and non-verified data in the non-processable form, from the first computer to the second computer.

It is submitted that the amended claims are now clear regarding how isolating the first and second computers from the data communications network is different from isolating a first data storage facility from a second data storage facility as is done in Ofek.

It should also be mentioned that in Ofek, isolation is performed only temporarily, during a back-up operation. On the other hand, the claims recite that transmission and receipt of any data is limited.

Touboul discloses encapsulating non-verified or non-verifiable data to prevent it from being executed. However, neither Touboul nor the reference cited for claims 23 and 24 compensates for the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Ofek.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the prior art rejections should be withdrawn. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct 6 2004

By: Mark J. Henry  
Mark J. Henry  
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501